

**OPINION 2215 (Case 3380)*****Streptopelia risoria* (Linnaeus, 1758) (Aves, COLUMBIDAE): priority maintained**

**Abstract.** The Commission has ruled that priority is maintained for *Streptopelia risoria* (Linnaeus, 1758), the specific name of the ringed turtle-dove (ringed dove; barbary dove). A proposal to conserve its junior subjective synonym *Streptopelia roseogrisea* (Sundevall, 1857), the specific name of the African collared dove, was not approved.

**Keywords.** Nomenclature; taxonomy; COLUMBIDAE; *Streptopelia roseogrisea*; *Streptopelia risoria*; ringed dove; ringed turtle-dove; barbary dove; African collared dove.

---

**Ruling**

- (1) It is hereby ruled that priority is maintained for *Columba risoria* Linnaeus, 1758.
- (2) The name *risoria* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Columba risoria*, is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

**History of Case 3380**

An application to conserve the name *Streptopelia roseogrisea* (Sundevall, 1857) for the African collared dove was received from Thomas M. Donegan (*ProAves Foundation, Reading, U.K.*). The senior subjective synonym *Streptopelia risoria* (Linnaeus, 1758) is in use for the domestic form of *S. roseogrisea*. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 64: 108–112 (June 2007). The title, abstract and keywords of the case were published on the Commission's website. A supportive comment was published in BZN 64: 192 and a clarifying comment was published in BZN 65: 63.

**Decision of the Commission**

On 1 June 2008 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 64: 110. At the close of the voting period on 1 September 2008 the votes were as follows:

Affirmative votes – 7: Bouchet, Brothers, Grygier, Kottelat, Lamas, Lim and Papp.

Negative votes – 10: Alonso-Zarazaga, Bogutskaya, Fautin, Halliday, Krell, Kullander, Pape, Rosenberg, van Tol and Zhang.

Minelli, Ng, Patterson, Pyle and Štys were on leave of absence.

Alonso-Zarazaga, voting against the proposal, said that the name *S. risoria* had been in common use and the selection of *S. roseogrisea* as the valid name would infringe on the Principle of Priority without need, following a personal preference of the author. He asked the Commission to place *Columba risoria* Linnaeus, 1758 on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology. He further stated that decisions should be taken case by case and authors should not request the Commission to follow positions adopted for animals in other taxonomic groups, as in Opinion 2027, that

might not be applicable in this case. Halliday, voting against the proposal, said the reason for his decision could be found at the end of paragraph 6 of the case where the author announced his intention to designate a neotype for *S. risoria*, thus throwing the case into confusion. No information had been provided as to the existence of types of either *S. risoria* or *S. roseogrisea*. There appeared to be only one taxonomic species present and, before the Commission could make a decision about the name or names of this taxon, they would need information about the identity of the types, including the proposed neotype. The author could perhaps choose the type of *S. roseogrisea* as the neotype of *S. risoria*, and so make the two names objective synonyms. In paragraph 3 the author presented evidence that *S. roseogrisea* and *S. risoria* interbred freely, so should be regarded as a single taxonomic species. However, in the beginning of paragraph 6 he referred to them as 'these two species'. In view of the ambiguity over whether one or two species were involved, and in the absence of information about any existing types, Halliday could not vote in favour of the proposal. If the author should decide to re-write the proposal, Halliday suggested that he should delete the discussion of Opinion 2027 and Case 3010 which would invoke precedent from a previous case. As the author himself had stated, 'Opinion 2027 applies only to the species mentioned therein'. Kullander, voting against the proposal, said he disagreed with the arguments. He said that when there were two names for the same taxon one picked the oldest as valid. He further thought that the earlier similar case involving mammals was irrelevant and could not be regarded as a general precedent. Rosenberg, voting against, pointed out that the action requested should have been a reversal of precedence whenever the two names were regarded as synonyms and not a ruling that *S. roseogrisea* was not invalid. This would not, however, have affected his vote.

### Original references

The following is the original reference to the name placed on the Official List by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

*risoria*, *Columba*, Linnaeus, 1758, *Systema Naturae*, Ed. 10, p. 165.